

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated December 26, 2001.

Claims 1-29 have been canceled. New claims 30-49 have been added.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections contained in the Office Action is hereby requested.

Claims 1-29 were restricted into three groups of claims, Group I comprising claims 1-23, 25 and 26, Group II comprising claim 24, and Group III comprising claims 27-29. Applicants elected Group I for further prosecution in this case, but have now canceled all of claims 1-29, thus rendering the restriction moot.

Claims 1-23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 112 and also under 35 USC 103 primarily over the Chase reference, US 5,974,238. Although applicants traverse these rejections, the claims at issue have now been canceled, thus rendering the specific rejections moot.

New claims 30-49 have been added for consideration. These claims are patentably distinct from Chase for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 30 recites a method of forwarding messages from a wired network to a plurality of wireless mobile devices. The method includes the following steps: (A) transmitting messages from a plurality of computer systems to a plurality of message stores via the wired network, wherein the message stores are addressed by a plurality of first electronic address; (B) associating each of the plurality of first electronic addresses with a user of at least one of the plurality of wireless mobile devices; (C)

detecting a forwarding event at a message forwarding server; (D) storing the messages at the message stores; (E) encrypting the messages; (F) encapsulating the encrypted messages into electronic envelopes including a wireless network address of the wireless mobile device associated with the first electronic address of the message store where the message is stored; (G) forwarding the electronic envelopes containing the encrypted messages to a wireless gateway system coupled to the message forwarding server by an Internet connection; (H) receiving the electronic envelopes at the wireless gateway system and forwarding the electronic envelopes to a wireless network that broadcasts the electronic envelopes using the wireless network addresses of the wireless mobile devices; (I) for each broadcast electronic envelope, removing the electronic envelope and decrypting the message at the wireless mobile device having a wireless network address matching the wireless network address broadcast by the wireless system; and (J) storing the messages at the wireless mobile device.

Chase discloses a system for synchronizing primarily calendar data between a single desktop computer system and a single personal digital assistant via a wireless network. (See, FIG. 1D and 1E of Chase, showing a desktop computer coupled to a PDA via a wireless carrier). Although Chase hints at updating calendar data at a network server in the Background section of his patent, he provides no further teaching as to how this network server application may be implemented, and therefore with respect to server synchronization, the Chase patent is not enabling. (See, col. 2, ll. 45-49)

Chase only relates to Personal Information Manager (PIM) type data

synchronization, such as calendar information, appointment information, etc., and does not deal with message forwarding from a wired network to a plurality of wireless mobile devices. Therefore, as a threshold matter, the Chase patent is not related to the same type of method as described in claim 1.

More specifically, Chase does not provide any of the steps (A) – (J) set forth in claim 1. Chase does not teach transmitting messages from a plurality of computer systems to a plurality of message stores via a wired network, wherein the message stores are addressed by a plurality of first electronic addresses. Instead, Chase teaches updating calendar data at a desktop system. Chase does not teach the step of associating each of the plurality of first electronic addresses with a user of at least one of the plurality of wireless mobile devices. Instead, Chase teaches a one-to-one correspondence between a desktop system and a PDA. Chase does not teach the step of detecting a forwarding event at a message forwarding server. Instead, Chase teaches detecting a change in the PIM data at the desktop system. Chase does not teach the step of storing the messages at the message stores. Instead, Chase teaches storing PIM data at a desktop system. Chase does not teach encrypting the messages. There is no encryption disclosure in Chase. Chase also does not teach the encapsulating, forwarding, receiving, removing and storing steps set forth in claim 1. Instead, Chase merely teaches the steps of sending calendar update information from the desktop system to the PDA via a wireless network.

Claim 30 is therefore patentably distinguishable from Chase. Claims 31-49 depend from claim 30 and are therefore also distinguishable from Chase. In addition,

these claims recite many other limitations and steps that are simply not disclosed in Chase and are therefore patentably distinguishable from Chase.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES, DAY, REAVIS & POGUE
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: 6/26/02

By: David B. Cochran
David B. Cochran
Reg. No. 39,142

North Point
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44114